DOMINANCE-FEELING, BEHAVIOR, AND STATUS[1]

BY A. H. MASLOW

Institute of Educational Research, Teachers College, Columbia University

This paper has several purposes. (1) It will present briefly the heuristic system of definitions and concepts relative to dominance in human beings that has arisen as a product of experimental researches in dominance in human beings and infra-human primates.[2] It appears to the writer that this conceptual framework is more useful than other discussions of will-to-power, dominance, power drive, etc., and has the inestimable advantage of being an *experimental* product of work with normal subjects rather than a clinical or philosophical one. Neither is it a product of any urge to system-building. It is therefore less apt to be distorted factually by the sort of esthetic architectonic that hates inconsistencies or unsolved problems and attempts to fit them to the Procrustean bed of an *a priori*, prearranged theoretical scheme.

(2) It will present discursively some of the broader conclusions arrived at as a result of these researches.

It has been found necessary to distinguish between the following and to treat them as separate psychological data: dominance-feeling, dominance behavior, dominance status, craving or desire for dominance, feelings of inferiority and

[1] I wish to express my thanks to Drs. E. L. Thorndike, G. Murphy, L. B. Murphy, S. Asch, Miss Neva Lowman, and Miss Ruth Ritzman for useful suggestions and criticisms. This study is one item in a program of research supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation.

[2] In a series of papers on dominance in monkeys, (12), (13), (14), (15), (16), the interested reader may trace for himself the struggle to approach some useful definition of dominance. The definitions employed here, however, could not have come from work with either humans or animals alone, but were made with reference to the comparative facts in both. While fuller reports of the work with humans will be published in the future, it may be well to give a very brief indication of the technique used. About 100 women and 15 men, most of college age and intellectual calibre, were studied very carefully by means of long, intensive interviews that attempted (1) to understand the whole personality of the subject, and (2) to understand the role that dominance played in this personality picture.

superiority, matter-of-fact superiority and inferiority, and compensatory dominance behavior. This paper will be built around the discussion of these concepts and the demonstration of the interrelations between them.

I. Dominance Status and Dominance-Feeling

Dominance Status.—It may be readily observed in pairs of human beings that, in a good many cases, one member of the pair will dominate the other. He will lead, suggest, order or inhibit the behavior of the subordinate one. The latter will often defer to the wishes of the dominant one, and respect him more than the dominant one respects *him*. In a marriage, for instance, in which the wife definitely and strongly dominates the husband, her opinion will usually prevail whenever there is any conflict; she will be more forceful and direct in the expression of her opinions than he will. In their social relationship, she is more confident in her behavior, gets what she wants more often than does the husband, feels superior to him, generally feels herself to be stronger than he is, and respects herself more than she does him. Her behavior, depending on the kind of dominance, is apt to express either (1) condescension, contempt, impatience, irritability, (2) pity, tenderness, protectiveness or good-natured toleration, or (3) aloofness and superiority.

The husband's behavior will express inferiority, deference, child-parent attitude, respect, 'looking up to,' willingness to concede. He *asks* rather than *tells* in his conversation and is apt to change his opinion if his dominant partner questions it.

If, however, we examine the further social relations of these two people, we find that she may stand in exactly the same relationship to certain other people as her husband stands to her, that is, other people may dominate her. Also we shall inevitably find that there are some people to whom the husband stands in a dominant relationship. He will now behave and feel in these relationships, approximately the same as his wife behaves and feels with respect to him.

It is this kind of relationship to which the terms 'dominance status' and 'subordinate status' refer. They may be

Page Missing

Page Missing

the words and phrases which dominant people themselves have used when asked to describe their own feelings about themselves.[5]

Low-dominance feeling generally consists of either the absence or opposite of these feelings, as well as of certain positive and unique characteristics. Very often a low-dominance person will describe his feelings about himself in negative fashion. "I lack self-confidence." "I feel inferior with most people." "I guess I don't think much of myself." "I think I'd rather be like someone else if I could." The feelings of persons of this type are of uncertainty, lack of confidence, general inferiority, shame or lack of pride, weakness, general admiration and respect for others rather than for themselves, a feeling of being, in a very metaphorical sense, 'below' others, of being looked down upon, of wanting to be like someone else rather than oneself, of being dominated by others, of lack of faith in oneself and in one's abilities. They often feel shy, inhibited, timid, unworthy, self-conscious and embarrassed. Generally they cannot be said to be satisfied with themselves. This is further illustrated by the presence of inferiority feelings as an important and primary part of the personality picture in low-dominance people (which is only infrequently the case in high-dominance people).[6] Generally, in low-dominance people we do not see the ease, the calm, the natural assurance, the lack of restraint and

[5] It is necessary at this point to insist as strenuously as possible that dominance-feeling be not confused with domineeringness, with antagonism to others, willfulness, impoliteness, selfishness, aggressiveness, tyrannizing, etc. If the reader finds himself prone to think of a high-dominance person as rather a nasty person, one who would push him out of line or punch him in the face, let him substitute 'self-confidence' for 'high-dominance feeling.' and 'lack of confidence' for 'low-dominance feeling.' They are not synonymous, but at least the substitutes bring less misunderstanding in this direction. The writer uses the word 'dominance' because, even after much thought, he has not been able to find one that is not also misunderstood, and at least our phrase makes the animal work continuous with work for children and adult human beings. Another possible substitute is high or low ego-level.

[6] This list of at least partially disparate feelings and attitudes would indicate that dominance-feeling is not a unitary thing, that it is more heterogeneous than homogeneous. It is probably more cautious to proceed on the basis of such an assumption, since unitariness of all these aspects of dominance-feeling has not yet been proved. It is the writer's belief and impression, however, that dominance-feeling is ultimately a simplex, rather than a complex.

'tension,' the lack of fearfulness, that impresses us in high-dominance people.

One question that frequently comes up in the mind of the person not thoroughly acquainted with the various concepts of dominance is the variability with mood. He is apt to think that at one time a person feels very dominant and at another time very subordinate. Of course this opinion is partly due to the confusion between dominance-feeling and status. It is perfectly true that status can vary widely with a situation and that the general mood is, to some extent, a reflection of the status, but it is the writer's impression that, as a usual thing, dominance-feeling fluctuates (because of mood) only within a small range of the total range of dominance. Introspectively, of course, any one person knows only his own range of dominance-feeling and is apt to regard it as a very wide one. With increased knowledge of the total range for the general population, realization of the comparatively minor size of his own individual fluctuation is sure to ensue.

There is no doubt that a long series of successes or failures, shocks, traumata, continual subjection to one kind of status rather than another will all have their effect on general dominance-feeling—that is to say, there may be a slow long-time lowering or raising with long-time success or failure. Feeling, however, is a relatively stable thing. It can change, but it needs major impacts and many of them for this change to occur.

If we were forced to choose a single synonym or definition for dominance-feeling, we should say that it was chiefly the the evaluation of, or confidence in, the personality (self-confidence). High-dominants evaluate their personalities or selves highly; the self of the low-dominant is given a low evaluation by the subject himself.[7] Between the two extremes described, there are all degrees of intermediate strengths of evaluation of, or confidence in, the self, and the whole forms a smooth continuum on a single dimension, in which it is possible to place almost any single person. It is

[7] This means evaluation of the *whole* personality, rather than just one part of it. A person may evaluate his intelligence very highly indeed and still be low in dominance-feeling. See below, page 412.

obvious that, since this dominance-feeling varies in degree, it is susceptible to treatment by the usual statistical and experimental methods that have been used, for instance, with such great success in the consideration of intelligence. Such a phrasing, it seems to the writer, is a far more useful one to the *science* of psychology than the clinical, psychotherapeutic, qualitative treatment accorded it by the psychological physicians (even though we have probably oversimplified).

II. The Relationship Between Dominance-Feeling and Dominance Status

Feeling and status of dominance are at least partially circular in their relationship. Feeling, to a large extent, determines status, and status (to a lesser extent) also determines feeling.

When two people come together in a face-to-face relationship, a conscious or unconscious sizing-up process ensues, that looks much like what we see in infra-human primates (14). This process, of course, is infinitely more subtle than it is in animals. It is much more influenced by the immediate psycho-social situation, and by such cultural elements as clothes, wealth, reputation, social position, etc. Also, in meetings of unlike-sex pairs, the generally inferior position of women in our culture puts her at a further disadvantage.[8]

It is still possible and valid, however, to point out that the main elements at work in this sizing-up process are the levels

[8] It is interesting to compare with these statements the conclusions and speculations of the writer on the establishment of dominance status in pairs of monkeys meeting for the first time. "Our suggestion would be that dominance (status) is determined by, or actually is a composite of social attitudes, attitudes of aggressiveness, confidence or cockiness . . . . A very apparent 'sizing-up' process goes on during the first few moments of meeting, and it is during these moments and during this process that dominance (status) seems to be established" (14, p. 305). In these animals difference in size was very important in this sizing-up process. This is much less true for humans, although still a factor. In retrospect, it is at least possible to read for 'social attitudes, attitudes of aggressiveness, confidence or cockiness,' simply 'dominance-feeling,' with the one amendment that aggresssiveness is not a necessary or even usual component of dominance status in human beings. In humans, as in animals, the first meeting is usually far more important in determining dominance status than any single subsequent meeting.

of dominance-feeling in the two members of the pair. Each has a certain opinion of himself, of his own strength and forcefulness, of his capabilities and shortcomings, of his own place in the generality of people whom he has met and whom he will meet. It is this evaluation of the self that is compared with the evaluation of the self (expressed overtly) before him, and it is from the unconscious perception or realization of the comparative status of the two personalities that the dominance-subordination relationship of the particular social group emerges, in some cases immediately, if the relative status of dominance-feeling is very obvious to both members of the pair, in other cases slowly and with much feeling-out and unconscious 'sparring.' In still other cases, there need be no emergence of a relationship of dominance-subordination; instead we may have a perception of equality, friendship, and mutual respect, with a consequent status of equality for the two members of the pair.[9] To some extent, also, in such pair relationships, it is possible to have 'split dominance status.' That is to say, one of the pair may be by

[9] Dr. Max Wertheimer, in private conversation, has brought up the following very interesting point. Dominance-feeling is to some extent connected with being 'high.' This can mean (1) higher than others, better than they are, or (2) 'high' in the sense of being adequate to the task or problem in hand, without reference to comparison with other men. That is to say, there are those artists, physicians, or scientists who wish only to express themselves as adequately as possible—to help, to serve, to fulfill their obligations to society, and to express themselves to the best of their abilities. What others might do in a similar situation has nothing to do with the self-evaluation. An artist who has painted a portrait may think in either of two ways: "Is this better than the products of my rivals?", or "Does this satisfy me; is it the best I can do; does it express my original conception satisfactorily?" Some artists need the admiration of audiences and the stimulus of rivalry, but some artists do *not*. These evaluate themselves only by an internal and personal scale of values rather than by a social, competitive criterion.

I agree that, even though people of this latter type are rare, they should be considered, since their rarity is not so much a reflection of fundamental emphasis in human nature as it is a product of the dominant trends of rivalry, competition, urge-for-power-over-others which characterize our culture. Presumably, in a coöperative culture such personalities would be the rule rather than the exception.

In this same connection we may mention also Dr. Wertheimer's insistence on other determiners of dominance behavior, for instance, sheer *need* for dominance behavior because of the situation; *e.g.*, a father who sees his child assaulted by a bully may behave in a way that has no reference whatsoever to his dominance-feeling. Another possible source of dominance behavior is being right or correct when others are not. Still another determiner of behavior that might look like dominance is hyper-energy.

far the better of the two in intellectual equipment and capabilities, whereas the other may be recognized as the undoubted superior in social abilities and equipment.

This latter relationship of 'split dominance' is met less frequently than most people think. For one thing, people usually have few voluntary contacts with those who are very different from themselves in any important respects. The person who values intellect very highly is not so apt to come in close and sustained contact with persons who do not value intellect highly. In the second place, the more usual rule is that all the capabilities, strengths and weaknesses of the personality are thrown together into a unit and it is this *unit* that is the basis of comparison with others. The usual person thinks of himself as a whole and not as a melange of separate and discrete superiorities or inferiorities.[10] It is true that the psychologist, from the outside, may diagnose Case L. M. B. to be one of high dominance-feeling, which seems to be built mostly upon an undoubted attractiveness to, and success with, men. L. M. B. herself, however, does not diagnose herself so. To herself, she is simply a superior person in a very general

[10] Dr. E. Duffy and Dr. G. Murphy have pointed out that sheer dominance-feeling or feeling of general inner strength seem to some extent to vary independently of evaluations of some sub-abilities or sub-sections of the personality. In empirical terms, this has meant in our study that we have had subjects who were low or middle in general dominance-feeling at the same time that they were superior and felt superior in (1) intellectual ability, (2) social ability or intelligence (girls who come from 'best families' and who have recognized social status), and (3) mechanical ability. There are probably more, but these are the only ones we have ourselves observed. We have also observed cases in which complete inferiority in any one of these respects was taken calmly and matter-of-factly without any repercussions on general dominance-feeling. For example, one man with high dominance-feeling seemed to be completely untouched by the fact of his inferiority in mechanical abilities, and there was even detectable in him a slightly condescending attitude toward people who were interested in such things. It is the degree of importance assigned to a particular ability by the subject himself that will determine its importance as a builder of dominance-feeling. An intellectual's level of dominance-feeling is pinned far more closely to his superiority or inferiority in intelligence than would be the case, for example, in a professional athlete. It is the writer's experience that social inadequacy is less apt to vary independently of dominance-feeling than either intellectual or mechanical inadequacy. That is to say, it is easy to find cases of people of low dominance-feeling who are confident in their ability to handle teacups, introductions, and matters of etiquette correctly, but cases of people who are high in dominance-feeling and who at the same time lack the superficial social attainments are much more rare, although they can be found.

sense. It is even truer to say that she does not diagnose herself at all; she simply feels superior.

We have already described above the general syndrome of behavior and mutual attitude for the dominance-subordination status relationship. To some extent such syndromes must remain a generalized abstraction or averaging of the realities of behavior, since there are several different ways of expressing dominance, any one of which may be used by an individual (either monkey or man). Some dominants are protectors, others are tyrants, others are 'individualists' in the sense that they do not readily express dominance in behavior so long as others do not try to dominate them.[11] To be more accurate, we should describe at least three syndromes of dominance-subordination status behavior, corresponding to these three kinds of dominant people.

One further amendment must be made to the generalized description of status behavior that we have outlined. If either person in the relationship is at either extreme of the distribution of dominance-feeling, modification of status behavior is likely to result. For one thing, the person high in dominance-feeling is apt to be very restive in subordinate status, especially if the person in dominant status is arrogant, tyrannical, silly, bullying, or if in general he is felt not to be worthy of dominance status. Further it is the writer's impression, although he has too few observations bearing on this point, that persons very low in dominance-feeling may never or rarely behave in a dominant fashion even when in dominance status, especially if the person or persons in subordinate status are felt to be higher in dominance-feeling. (This may be the case, for instance, in some such instance as the housewife, low in dominance-feeling, who is mistress of several servants.)

Aside from these and similar considerations, the dominance-feelings of the members of this pair or group are apt to have

[11] We have observed at least these three qualities of dominance expression in three species of infra-human primates. The dominant macacus rhesus is typically a tyrant and a bully, the chimpanzee a friend and a protector, and the cebus monkey an 'individualist' in the above sense. See (12). See also Bühler (4) for descriptions of three types of social personality in children.

surprisingly little influence on status behavior, after relative status has once been determined. In rhesus monkeys it was found possible to study many separate interpairings of animals and then to treat one animal with dominance status as equivalent to any other animal with dominance status. One could do the same for all (rhesus) monkeys in subordinate status. One dominant animal, by and large, behaves like any other dominant status animal, and a subordinate status animal behaves like any other animal in this same status. And in our experiments this held true *even when we paired and interpaired a small group of six animals.* This same animal A, who was dominant over B and subordinate to C, behaved like any other dominant animal with B, and like any other subordinate animal with C.

It may be assumed that these animals differed in dominance-feeling but, once social status was determined, it was impossible to diagnose the level of dominance-feeling of the individuals concerned except in extreme cases. See, for instance, the behavior of Kathryn (**16**), a strong dominance animal, who occupied subordinate status in the pairings because of her youth and small size.

In other words, for these rhesus monkeys there seem to be only two kinds of status, dominance and subordination, and within each status we have found relatively little range of individual differences determined by dominance-feeling. (This is much less true for chimpanzees and cebus monkeys.)

In humans we find some likenesses and some differences. Generally we find more similarity between pairs (*e.g.*, married couples) than we might have suspected. We may find in one married couple that the husband is dominant to the wife but that both are very high in individual dominance-feeling. In another couple we may find the same status of wife and husband but find them both *low* in individual dominance-feeling. In these two pairs we shall find much community of behavior. The same seems to be true (although our evidence is limited) where the status is reversed, *i.e.*, the wife is dominant over the husband.

True, the level of dominance-feeling in the individual will determine broad differences (chiefly in attitude toward sexual behavior) from one pair to the other, and we shall find the dominance-feeling of the individuals determining relationship to outside people in the expected way, but the married relationships *qua* relationship in the two married couples are similar in their broad outlines, *e.g.*, one determines, the other concedes, one tends to withdraw before the anger of the other, respect flows more in one direction than in the other, one is more 'powerful' than the other, etc.

As in the monkeys, we find at the extremes of the range of dominance-feeling some determination of differential behavior in subordinate status. A woman with very high dominance-feeling, who is nevertheless in subordinate status to her husband, tends to criticize, to quarrel and to resent her status, and sometimes attempts to change it.

It has been found that this fact of little range of behavior within a status has extensive implications for the methodology of studying dominance in humans. The experimenter who attempts to determine dominance rating by inspection or short interview will inevitably find that he underrates the dominance-feeling of many people who stand in a subordinate status with respect to him, and to overrate many people who stand in a dominant relation to him. This follows naturally from our discussion above. All people in subordinate status to him will look spuriously alike in their general social behavior (with respect to the experimenter); all people who dominate the experimenter will look more similar to each other than they really are. To a giant all dwarfs look equally small and to a dwarf, giants look equally tall.[12]

[12] It follows that the interviewer must be very careful in several respects: (1) He must know where he himself stands in the scale of dominance-feeling; (2) he must not judge the dominance-feeling of a subject merely from the relationship obtaining in the interviewing room; (3) he must judge and rate the subject by the latter's behavior and feeling with respect to the *general* population, and not to one or two people; (4) if ratings of the subject are to be obtained, it is best that these be average ratings by several people who stand in a close relationship to him (as peers, *not* as parents, teachers, employers, etc.); (5) it follows also that, theoretically, the best single ratings in an experiment on the general population can be obtained from a rater who stands at the middle of the scale for dominance-feeling; (6) he must be careful to appreciate completely the influence of his own cultural status, *e.g.*, being a teacher, physician, older person, etc.

III. Dominance Behavior: Compensation

Dominance behavior is almost always social, almost always with respect to another person or persons. If it were possible to observe single isolated human beings in such a way that they were not aware of being observed, it is doubtful whether we could distinguish easily between even the most and the least dominant subjects on the basis of their behavior with respect to inanimate objects alone.

In social situations, however, it is usually possible to make at least a very rough rating of dominance-feeling of the subjects involved on the basis of their behavior alone. As the situation in which observations are made becomes more experimental, *i.e.*, constant psychologically from subject to subject, quantitatively scorable, etc., as for instance, in the experiments of Jack (**10**) and Page (**18**), the rating or score becomes more and more reliable and valid. This rating, if it hopes to measure dominance-feeling rather than mere dominance status, must be a composite of the behavior of the subject with respect to *many*, rather than one or two other subjects. When one attempts to rate the dominance-feeling of a subject on the basis of his behavior with respect to *one* other person, results are sure to be very inexact, for reasons that we have discussed above.

It must be remembered that dominance behavior may not be expressed by a woman as freely as by a man. The very definite training that most women in our culture get in being 'lady-like' (non-dominant) exerts its effect forever afterwards. The dominant woman may differ little or not at all in her dominance behavior from the median dominance woman, at least in the ordinary daily social routine. In any case, she at least knows *how* to be, as one subject phrased it, "innocent and girlish and sweet sixteen," and can put on this appearance at will, especially in dealing with people of the older generation. For instance, it seems, from all that can be gathered from the subjects of this study, that the ordinary college Dean of Women *never* sees any kind of behavior but this.[13]

[13] Inhibition of dominance behavior differs in various parts of the country, and it differs in different ways for the two sexes. For instance, the writer has been told by a

A few kinds of dominance behavior are to some extent independent of status, being instead almost purely functions of level of dominance-feeling. That is to say, a person with high dominance-feeling may show a degree of constancy in certain behaviors regardless of his status at the moment. The same is true for the low-dominance person to a lesser extent. For instance, the high-dominance woman in subordinate status—say, in an office—will not blush or be embarrassed or self-conscious even when she speaks to her boss (although other behavior *will* reflect the influence of her subordinate status, *e.g.*, deference, respectful behavior, etc.). Carriage, mien, demeanor of a certain type seem also to be constant characteristics of high-dominance women, regardless of status. For instance, it seems to the writer, although he has no more specific evidence than impression, that the high-dominance person stands more erectly and has better carriage, has a firm handshake, gazes steadily into the eye of the person to whom he or she is speaking, walks with a freer swing of the body, is less apt to hesitate or stammer in speaking, etc.[14]

There is, however, still another reason why dominance behavior alone is a weak reed to rest on if the desideratum is a rating of dominance-feeling; namely, the fact that some people compensate for a feeling of weakness (low dominance-feeling) by behaving in a very dominant fashion.

Compensation may be diagnosed when the behavior of the subject is rated higher in dominance than his dominance-feeling. Such subjects feel weak but wish to appear strong. In order

psychologist who was born and raised in the South that she was taught never to express dominance behavior openly with respect to men, at least marriageable men. It seemed to be permissible to attempt domination *after* marriage, but even this was to be done subtly by coaxing, wheedling, pleading, etc., rather than by any 'unladylike' and open forcefulness of behavior. As nearly as the writer can determine, open and at times cruel domination of Negroes is permitted for either sex, but even this differs with different classes of the population, and for different 'kinds' of Negroes. Various kinds of dominance behavior are treated differentially in other parts of the country, also. In completely different cultures, we may of course see even more marked discrepancies between dominance-feeling and behavior. For instance, among the Japanese, subordination behavior has become institutionalized as the *only* way to behave politely.

[14] A careful, extensive study of dominance-feeling and expressive movements, now being made by P. Eisenberg, will furnish a check-up on these and other hypotheses about dominance-feeling and behavior (6).

to achieve this end it is necessary for them to put about them a cloak of dominance behavior that, in a sense, is not 'natural' to them. Such people protect or defend themselves psychologically, and with only superficial observation of behavior to rely on, it is very easy to confuse these cases with genuine cases of high dominance-feeling.

If, however, we observe cases of *over*-compensation closely, certain characteristics of behavior may in some instances enable it to be distinguished from dominance behavior that flows from high dominance-feeling. In the first place, it is apt to give the observer the impression of being strained and unnatural. It is more aggressive and louder than seems to be appropriate to the situation. It is, in some cases, apt to be even somewhat vulgar, and may sometimes also give the observer the impression of expressing defiance or a chip-on-the-shoulder attitude, rather than calm assurance. Such people are apt to be more 'flip' than the average, to be hypercritical, to be 'wise-crackers,' to be ultra-sophisticated in a manner that indicates an eager desire to impress others with this quality. In several cases, feelings of conflict and ambivalence toward sex went with very free, even loose, talk about sex. In other instances the compensatory behavior took the form of apparent snobbishness with haughty, cold, aloof behavior. All the above is less true for compensating (rather than *over*-compensating) cases.

The compensating subjects turned out to be located around the middle of the distribution for dominance-feeling, both by interview rating and scores obtained in the author's 'Social Personality Inventory,' a test for dominance-feeling now in process of standardization. Of the relatively few subjects with low dominance-feeling that we have been able to study, there was no case of compensation.[15]

[15] There was no difficulty in getting women in the middle of the distribution and above to submit themselves to fairly embarrassing interviews concerning their private lives. It was practically impossible to get as subjects women at the lower end of the distribution. The few that were obtained were students of science and felt that it was their duty to submit themselves, especially in view of the almost tearful pleadings of the by now distraught experimenter. Low-dominance women find it extremely difficult and distasteful to reveal their psychological 'innards,' even for the sake of science. We do not care to make this a generalization, since of sixty women studied, only four

Very little can as yet be said about the etiology of the tendency to compensate, if we confine outselves to our own results.[16] Of interest, however, is the fact that, of twelve clear cases of compensation, eight were Jewish women, whereas Jewish women were only 20 per cent of the total group studied. The research lead here is obvious. The writer's 'hunch' is that at least one fruitful hypothesis about compensatory dominance behavior might be to consider it, for research purposes, the reaction of a minority cultural group to its feeling of not being quite at home in the larger cultural milieu, of not being completely wanted or respected. This hypothesis is borne out by the fact that behavior with family, with close friends, with the husband, etc., is *not* of the compensatory type. It occurs only when *defense* is felt to be necessary.[17]

Compensatory dominance behavior may be taken as one example of a larger concept; namely, discrepancy in general between feeling and behavior. We have already demonstrated that the correlation between feeling and behavior is not close in many instances. We should also mention the fact that in many instances in our own culture and in other cultures behavior is *less* dominant than feeling. The direction of the discrepancy would, to some extent, seem to be determined by the basic emphases of the culture in question. In aggressive, competitive, or rivalrous groups, high dominance behavior would be more desirable socially; and in such cultures we should expect to find much compensation and over-compensation in one sense. In Japan behavior is usually non-dominant, while feeling, on the other hand, is, so far as we can tell, more or less 'normally' distributed. There is cultural repression of overt dominance behavior in this instance.

were definitely low in dominance, and even in these there were some isolated instances of 'putting on a front' for psychological self-defense.

[16] We owe the invention of the concept of compensation to Alfred Adler (2), and his works should be consulted for extensive discussions of the role of compensation in the personality. We have deliberately restricted ourselves here to drawing conclusions *only* from our own data.

[17] One subject, a case of compensatory dominance behavior, said of a certain man who was conversing with her, "He was so dominant, I relaxed completely." Another girl, obviously compensatory, said she could not relax except in the company of very close friends or someone who was very dominant. In the company of one man, who dominated her completely, she always relaxed completely.

In the case of the early Christians the stress again was on lack of dominance behavior with respect to one's fellows. It is true that there was just as much stress on lack of dominance-feeling, and that the whole trend of thought was in the direction of humility and meekness, but it is easy to see that the cultural stress would have been far more efficient in stamping out dominance behavior than in stamping out dominance-feeling.

Dr. Wertheimer has suggested [18] the term 'psychological lying' for such discrepancy between feeling and behavior—since dominance behavior may give a completely false index to the immediate inner state that motivates it or is associated with it.

IV. Matter-of-fact Superiority and Inferiority

Dodge and Kahn (5) have made the distinction between *feelings* of inferiority or superiority on the one hand and matter-of-fact superiority or inferiority on the other. In our work this distinction has turned out to be a very fruitful one, being extremely important particularly in the consideration of the self-evaluation of the non-dominant woman. Our finding is that matter-of-fact superiority and inferiority are clearly and fairly objectively recognized and understood by the more dominant woman. In her, however, we do not find many *feelings* of inferiority (in a psychopathological sense). There may be feelings of superiority but they again are not in any sense psychopathological. They are rather calm, objective recognition of facts that exist.

In the non-dominant woman on the other hand, we find a very different state of affairs. Far greater stress is laid in the psychic life upon matter-of-fact inferiority, little stress upon matter-of-fact superiority, much as we should think that the opposite would be the case. Further, it has been found that regardless of matter-of-fact superiority or inferiority, a predominant role in the personality picture of non-dominance women is played by feelings of inferiority. These feelings in many cases have no bases in fact. That is to say, the outside

[18] In conversation.

world may recognize such a woman to be very intelligent, but she is very apt to have feelings of inferiority about her intelligence in spite of this. Where the opinion of the outside world about matter-of-fact superiority has finally been impressed upon and accepted by the non-dominant subject (as in the case of one woman who was outstandingly lovely), in no cases has the writer found that such recognition gives rise to feelings of superiority. Rather such recognition of matter-of-fact superiority is pushed into the background and is not used as one might expect in the building up of self-evaluation. It seems unimportant and has little influence in the personality picture of such women, whereas, on the other hand, the slightest matter-of-fact inferiority is selected out, magnified and concentrated upon. A dozen assurances of, for example, high intelligence, are outweighed by one statement or hint of the contrary. This seems much more important in the total personality than one would ever expect.

In summary, then, we may say in a very general fashion, that dominant women have few 'feelings' of inferiority, but that non-dominant women do have many such feelings of inferiority and in both cases the presence or absence of these feelings is not plainly determined by matter-of-fact inferiorities or superiorities.

V. The Craving for Dominance

It is very easy to confuse the craving or desire for dominance with the other concepts that have been presented above. They should be clearly distinguished. It is not, for instance, the same as dominance-feeling. Out tentative finding about the relationship between the two is that some people high in dominance-feeling do have the craving for dominance status, and others do not. This seems to go with the degree of presence of the independent variable of activity or aggressiveness. The dominant person who is high in aggressiveness or activity (in the Adlerian sense) is the extremely ambitious person who craves recognition of superiority by others or, in other words, dominance status (face-to-face). The dominant person who is not active in this sense, is quite content to feel

superior without attempting to force recognition of this superiority upon others. In other words, he is quite content to feel superior whether or not others recognize this superiority.

Obviously the cases we have described as compensatory may be said to have great craving for dominance status. They also have a desire to *feel* dominant. "I wish I could be calm and self-assured." No person high in dominance-feeling ever makes such a statement.

It is difficult to discuss the place of craving for dominance in the low dominance-feeling case, because of the small number of subjects. It is the writer's impression that there is a certain distrust of their own ability to maintain and be successful in dominance status. They do not wish to be bosses or executives or leaders simply because they think they would not be successful in such roles. But it is definitely true for the cases studied that they *do* crave higher dominance-feeling. They wish to be other than they are, in that they hate their feeling of inadequacy, of weakness and lack of forcefulness. They would wish not to be shy, bashful and timid. Their self-consciousness tortures them and they would like to be rid of it.

Another way of looking at the craving for dominance is to attempt to understand its place in our culture. If we consider the total range of dominance-feeling and of dominance behavior, it is obvious that in our society the upper ends of these distributions are the more socially approved ones. What we interpret as the craving for dominance may then be a direct expression of the fact that most of us are creatures of our culture and desire what it desires. If the cultural stress is upon high dominance-feeling and high dominance behavior, then these are what we wish or crave.

Finally, it is possible that the most parsimonious way of treating this concept is to think of it in specific, rather than general, terms. It may be possible and even desirable to speak *not* of craving for dominance, but of craving for health *per se*, or of an automobile (not for what it symbolizes psychologically, but simply for its own sake). Or one may crave to be free of timidity, not because of an attempt to increase self-

evaluation, but simply for vocational efficiency; *e.g.*, in order to be a better teacher or a more efficient physician.

VI. The Role of Dominance in the Total Personality

In our dealings with subjects as total personalities, we found, as an observational fact, that some high-dominance people were active and aggressive, and that others, equally high in dominance-feeling, were calm, quiet, and non-aggressive; some were sociable and some were not; some were highly sexed (in a sheerly physiological sense) and some were not. Of these four traits of dominance, activity, sociability, and sexual drive, any combination seemed to be possible. For instance, a single individual might be high in all traits, or high in any one and low in the others, or high in two and low in two, and so on.

No claim is made that these four traits analyze the personality definitively into a perfect and inclusive system.[19] There are many aspects of personality that were not considered because of the techniques used or because of the limitation of the research purpose. Nor is it necessarily true that these are fundamental and homogeneous. It may be that they are cross-cut, superficial, resultant products of other personality traits. These conclusions are presented merely as a set of variables that are independent from the point of view of a researcher interested in knowing how much can be predicted from a knowledge of dominance and in the hope that they may be suggestive. It is our experience that at least two general kinds of behavior that *cannot* be so predicted (within our framework of definition and method) are activity and sociability (also sexual drive). If it be conceded that one task of the experimentally oriented psychologist is to analyze the personality into the fewest possible number of mutually exclusive traits, whose measure would give us the optimum picture of the personality attainable by quantitative methods,

[19] Or better, *three* traits, since sheer physiological sexual drive has surprisingly little influence on personality, or for that matter, even on sexual behavior. The proofs for this statement will be presented in a forthcoming paper. Another possible dimension of personality is "ego-security."

then the particular system of proposed independent variables of personality presented here is a start in the right direction.

All three qualities taken together give a very nicely rounded and fairly complete picture of a particular individual. Knowing the subject's rating for them, we should be able to predict a good deal of his social behavior, of his relationships to specific kinds of people, of his interests, likes and dislikes, vocational aptitudes, etc.

It is interesting to note that factor analysis studies to some extent support the primary importance of the qualities we have mentioned (excluding sexuality which is not and cannot now be studied scientifically because of cultural restrictions). Flanagan's (7) well-known factor analysis of the four Bernreuter personality scales led him to the conclusion that these four (neuroticism, introversion-extroversion, self-sufficiency and dominance) were cross-cuts of two main variables which he named *self-confidence* and *sociability*. Flanagan's self-confidence comes close to our conception of dominance-feeling, and for the moment we may assume it to be an equivalent.

Williams (19) also made a factor analysis of some data on social behavior of children. Thirty traits were observed and rated separately. Analysis showed that two factors accounted for almost all these traits of behavior, ascendance-submission and what Williams calls approach-withdrawal. Examination of his data leads us to believe that this latter 'factor' is a combination of our two factors of sociability and activity.

A study by Dr. H. C. McCloy (17) of mutual character ratings by a group of intimately associated college men has given approximately similar results. The first two factors in McCloy's analysis are strikingly similar to Williams' two factors. The factor which he calls 'social qualities' again seems to be a complex of what we are here calling activity and sociability.

A recent study by Guilford and Guilford (9) again gives similar results. Factor analysis of the results from a test of introversion-extroversion brings to light five factors of which one seems to be comparable to dominance in one restricted sense, and another one to sociability.

While the validity and usefulness of the factor-analysis technique are still being discussed and being called into question, such similarity in four different studies using various kinds of material is surely suggestive.

It is as yet too early to say which of the various maps of the personality offered to us is best and most useful. We wish only to stress here that an empirical approach to this problem is possible. In the actual contact with many personalities we can find out, at least in a preliminary fashion, (1) which are the most important fundamental aspects of personality, (2) what is the most parsimonious way of analyzing the total personality into conveniently handled aspects, (3) which of these aspects of personality are related to each other and which are independently variable, and (4) what behavior is connected with each of these aspects.

The Relationship of Behavior to Inner State.—We have already demonstrated, in the field of sexual expression, that a single kind of behavior may be a product of (or may be correlated with) different inner states in animals. In monkeys, sexual behavior may be an expression of impulse to dominate, or it may be a direct product of physiological sexual tensions. There are also indications that the same thing is partially true for humans also.

We wish now to call attention to the fact that a single inner state may give rise to various different forms of behavior. This, of course, is nothing new, for Freud has long since pointed out (8) that a state of conflict and repression may result in expression through any one of the so-called 'Freudian mechanisms,' *e.g.*, sublimation, hysterical symptoms, rationalization, etc. We have pointed out above a few of the various possible relationships between dominance behavior and dominance-feeling and have, we think, demonstrated the lack of invariable relationship between them.

A start has been made in the analysis of seemingly similar behaviors that are, however, correlated with different inner states. For monkeys, see (15). We have attempted in this paper to indicate how compensatory dominance behavior and 'true' dominance behavior may be distinguished. In the

early stages of his work, the experimenter was unable to see any differences at all between them, just as at first he could see no overt differences between dominance-sexual behavior and hormone-sexual behavior in monkeys. Close observation and analysis gave at least partial success in both instances. It may be that the same will be the case in other similar problems.

VII. Culture, Personality and Dominance [20]

We wish to emphasize that the picture we have presented is drawn for *our culture alone*. And even then there are many indications that there exist many broad sectional-cultural differences of real significance within the United States alone. What is more, there are within the two places where most of this research was prosecuted (Madison, Wisconsin, and New York City) significant class, race, religious, educational and socio-economic differences in determination of dominance-feeling and behavior.

It may be that there will be found in the future, innate bases of one sort or another for individual differences in dominance-feeling within a particular cultural frame of reference. On *a priori* grounds, there would seem to be good reason to believe that differences in hormone balance which are independent of culture should have something to do with predisposing one individual to greater or lesser aggressiveness, for instance. At the moment, however, we cannot emphasize too strongly that, while such biochemical determiners have not yet been demonstrated conclusively, we are even now sure of some cultural determination of dominance-feeling, behavior and status.

The writer has made a study of some of the ethnological literature in the hope of finding broad common-human characteristics in connection with dominance. Little that is certain was carried away from this study beyond the fact that in most of the cultures which were studied, there seemed to be discernible relationships (of a kind) of dominance-subordination as be-

[20] I wish to thank Dr. Ruth Benedict for suggestions given in dealing with this subject.

tween individuals. That is to say, there seem to be found in most cultural groups some individuals who are considered to be 'inferior' persons, and these judgments of relative value of personalities seem to be as important in determining dominance status as they are in our culture. *But*, and this should be kept firmly in mind, the bases for a person considering himself 'superior' in cultures A, B, C and D may be widely different, and also the strength, ubiquity and nature of such relationships differ very widely from culture to culture.[21]

In some cultures, it seemed to the writer that (at least on the basis of the psychologically inadequate data usually presented by the social anthropologist) no distinction could be made between 'face-to-face' and 'cultural' dominance-subordination status. Or perhaps it might be better to say that in some cultures no evidence is given for the existence of the former. In very rigidly stratified and structural groups (caste system of India) most status relationships follow reflexly and without any lability from cultural status determined before the birth of either individual in any pair.

In other cultures with little structuring (*e.g.*, Eskimo), relationships of dominance-subordination are more often determined by such animal qualities as strength, size, agility, cunning, etc. See also Linton (11) on 'status personality.'

With few exceptions the behaviors characteristic of dominance-subordination feeling or status are local, cultural accidents. It follows, therefore, that the problem of understanding why particular behavioral ways of expressing dominance-feeling came to be *connected* with this feeling, is not so much a psychological as a cultural-historical study.

It is interesting to note the indications of a few universal (so far as we can tell) ways of expressing dominance and subordination in behavior. For instance, so far as our study has taken us, we have found no group any place in the world where kneeling, bowing or prostrating oneself before another person is an expression of dominance. These and similar forms of behavior express *only* subordination in all those cases

[21] Among such cultures as the Zuñi, we find many forms that can be interpreted only as a stamping-out by the group of the impulse to dominate (3).

in which they have any social-personal meaning at all. It may be the fact that the writer has found this same tendency in monkeys (for the dominant animal to be physically above the subordinate animal) that causes him to suspect a deeper significance in this trend than would appear on the surface.

Another instance of similarity between the infra-human and the human primate is the expression of dominance by sexual aggression. Wherever we find rape or forced marriage to exist in a recognizable form in primitives or in the history of civilized nations we find that it is the females of the conquered peoples who are its object. And it is just this act that is the last bitter sign of complete submission and humiliation for the men of the conquered people. On purely *a priori* grounds there seems to be no reason why the case should not have been quite otherwise, *i.e.*, that the women of the conquering peoples should not have forced the conquered men to sexual connection or marriage. But this seems never to have been the case (except for certain kinds of individuals in special circumstances which will be discussed in another paper).

Other possible instances of such universal dominance behavior are the infliction of death, and the expression of superior strength (we know of no instance of strength-competition in which to be the weaker one is to be the more dominant). We are not aware, furthermore, of any group in which inferior height is regarded as a dominant characteristic over greater height (within 'normal' limits). Again in no case (in the few cultures for which this behavior is described) is a less sexually potent man regarded as dominant over the more potent and virile man. Quite as interesting as this is the fact that this is *not* true for women.

However, these few instances of possible universality of dominance behavior (throughout the Primate order) are far outnumbered by the multitudes of local, cultural, dominance behaviors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ADLER, A., The neurotic constitution, New York: Moffat, Yard, 1917, pp. xxiii + 456.
2. ——, Organic inferiority and its psychical compensation, New York: Nervous and Mental Diseases Publishing Co., 1917, pp. x + 86.

3. BENEDICT, R., Patterns of culture, New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1934, pp. xii + 290.
4. BUHLER, C., The social behavior of the child, in 'A Handbook of Child Psychology' (Ed. C. Murchison), Worcester: Clark University Press, 1931, pp. 392.
5. DODGE, R. AND KAHN, E., The craving for superiority, New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1931, pp. vii + 69.
6. EISENBERG, P., Dominance and expressive movements, *Arch. of Psychol.* (to be published).
7. FLANAGAN, J. C., Factor analysis in the study of personality, Stanford Univ. Press, 1935, pp. ix + 103.
8. FREUD, S., General introduction to psychoanalysis, New York: Boni and Liveright, 1920, pp. x + 406.
9. GUILFORD, J. P. AND GUILFORD, R. B., Personality factors S, E and M, and their measurement, *J. of Psychol.*, 1936, 2, 109–127.
10. JACK, L. M., An experimental study of ascendant behavior in pre-school children, *Univ. Iowa Studies: Studies in Child Welfare*, 1934, 9, No. 3.
11. LINTON, R., The study of man; an introduction, New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1936, pp. viii + 503.
12. MASLOW, A. H., The dominance drive as a determiner of social behavior in infra-human primates (abstract), *Psychol. Bull.*, 1935, 29, 117–118.
13. ——, The role of dominance in the social and sexual behavior of infra-human primates: I. Observation at Vilas Park Zoo, *J. Genet. Psychol.*, 1936, 48, 261–277.
14. —— AND FLANZBAUM, S., II. The experimental determination of the dominance behavior syndrome, *J. Genet. Psychol.*, 1936, 48, 278–309.
15. ——, III. A theory of sexual behavior of infra-human primates, *J. Genet. Psychol.*, 1936, 48, 310–338.
16. ——, IV. The determination of hierarchy in pairs and in a group. *J. Genet. Psychol.*, 1936, 49, 161–198.
17. MCCLOY, H. C., A factor analysis of personality traits to underlie character education, *J. Educ. Psychol.*, 1936, 27, 375–388.
18. PAGE, M. L., The modification of ascendant behavior in preschool children, *Univ. of Iowa Studies: Studies in Child Welfare*, 1936, 12, No. 3.
19. WILLIAMS, H. M., A factor analysis of Berne's "Social behavior patterns in young children," *J. Exper. Educ.*, 1935, 4, 142–146.

[MS. received January 16, 1937]